

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,021	07/26/2002	Naomi L. Esmon	11146//10904	4924
75	90 06/17/2004		EXAMINER	
	Brown & Wood	SAUCIER, SANDRA E		
Suite 3400 717 North Harw	vood	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Dallas, TX 75201			1651	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary				ESMON ET AL.			
		10/088,02					
		Examine		Art Unit			
		Sandra S		1651			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com period for reply specified above is less than thirty ( period for reply is specified above, the maximum s re to reply within the set or extended period for repl reply received by the Office later than three months ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ev munication. 30) days, a reply within the stat tatutory period will apply and w y will. by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply b utory minimum of thirty (30) ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS f dication to become ABANDO	be timely filed  I days will be considered timely.  Ifrom the mailing date of this communication.  ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <i>12 Mav 2004</i> .					
, —		·					
3)							
Disposit	ion of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1,7-11,13-20 and 22-25 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 12,21 and 26-33 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>							
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on 26 July 2002 Applicant may not request that any objected the oath or declaration is objected to	$2$ is/are: a) $\square$ accepte ection to the drawing(s) by the correction is require	oe held in abeyance. red if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
2) Notice 3) Infor	pt(s)  Due of References Cited (PTO-892)  Due of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( Due of Draftsperson's Patement(s) (PTO-1449 of the No(s)/Mail Date 8/7/02.		4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1651

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-33 are pending. Claims 1, 7-33 are considered on the merits.

### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on 5/12/04 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 INDEFINITE

Claims 1 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is an incomplete claim in that no step of assessing the propensity of patient risk for thrombotic disease as required by the preamble, is present in the body of the claim.

Claim 25 does not further limit claim 24.

#### SCOPE

Claims 1, 7, 8, 13–17, 22–25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for determining thrombotic disease risks or the presence of antibodies which selectively block the action of oxidized lipids, using an assay involving activated protein C and PE:PS:PC, does not reasonably provide enablement for determining such a risk using any and all clotting assays. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

nature of the invention

Art Unit: 1651

The invention is directed to determining risk of thrombotic disease by performing a coagulation assay with and without the presence of oxidized phospholipids containing PE and comparing the results.

#### breadth of the claims

The claims are directed to the performance of any coagulation test and require the use of a non-oxidized and oxidized phospholipid to determine patient risk for thrombotic disease.

amount of guidance and working examples

The specification clearly states that activated protein C is the target molecule that oxidized phospholipids act upon. Further, in Figure 1, it is shown that a difference in the clotting time is obtained only when activated protein C and oxidized and non-oxidized PE is present. A mixture of PS:PC and APC does not yield differences in clotting time with/without the presence of oxidized PS:PC. Therefore, the set of reagents used in the method must contain PE.

state of the prior art and unpredictability

There does not appear to be any prior art directed to the intended determination of propensity of patient risk for thrombotic disease or determination of antibodies which selectively block the action of oxidized lipids.

Undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as claimed due to the amount of experimentation necessary because of the limited amount of guidance and limited number of working examples in the specification, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, breadth of the claims and the unpredictability of the art.

As set forth in In re Fisher, 427 F2.d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA) 1970: [Section 112] requires that the scope of the claims must bear a

Art Unit: 1651

reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art.

In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of the enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved. Ex parte Humphreys, 24 USPQ2d, 1260.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action: A person shall be entitled to a patent unless (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 7, 9-11, 13, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Aviram *et al.* [AR].

The claims are directed to a method of comparing clotting times in the presence and absence of oxidized phospholipid reagent. The final step of the method is a mental step of concluding or determining.

Aviram *et al.* disclose a method of comparing clotting times in the presence and absence of oxidized LDL which contains phospholipids. Thus, the active steps are the same as the active steps of the instantly claimed method.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12, 21, 26-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Saucier whose telephone

Art Unit: 1651

number is (571) 272-0922. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, M. Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sandra Saucier Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651